R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 440 VT 002 353

NEGROES IN APPRENTICESHIP. MANPOWER AUTOMATION RESEARCH MONOGRAPH NO. 6.

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION (DOL), WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE AUG 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.64 39P.

DESCRIPTORS- VOLUNTARY INTEGRATION, *NEGRO EMPLOYMENT, *LABOR UNIONS, NEGROES, NEGRO YOUTH, *APPRENTICESHIPS, EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS, *EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES (JOBS), PRIVATE AGENCIES, LABOR STANDARDS, GOVERNMENT ROLE, COMMUNITY ACTION, LABOR LAWS, SOCIOECONOMIC INFLUENCES, POLICY, DIRECTORIES, PROGRAM EVALUATION,

SELECTED PORTIONS OF A STUDY, "NEGRO PARTICIPATION IN APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS" (VT 004 310) BY F.R. MARSHALL AND V. M. BRIGGS, JR., ARE PRESENTED TO FOSTER ACTION TO AFFORD FULLY EQUAL APPRENTICESHIP OPPORTUNITY. APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA, CLEVELAND, PITTSBURGH, CINCINNATI, DETROIT, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND, HOUSTON, ATLANTA, AND WASHINGTON WERE STUDIED THROUGH NUMEROUS INTERVIEWS WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF LABOR, MANAGEMENT, CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS, GOVERNMENT, EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, AND NEGRO YOUTH. THE STUDY CONCLUDED THAT THE INADEQUATE SUPPLY OF NEGROES WHO PRESENTLY WANT TO OR CAN QUALIFY FOR APPRENTICESHIP IS, MORE THAN DISCRIMINATION, THE CHIEF OBSTACLE TO WIDER PARTICIPATION OF NEGROES IN THE 350 APPRENTICEABLE TRADES. OF 21,500 APPRENTICES EMPLOYED ON FEDERALLY SUPPORTED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN 1964, 483 (2.2 PERCENT) WERE NEGRO. DESPITE FEDERAL AND LOCAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS REQUIRING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY, THERE HAVE BEEN NO SIGNIFICANT INCREASES IN THE NUMBER OF NEGRO APPRENTICES. THE GREATEST BARRIER HAS BEEN THE LACK OF MAJOR EFFORTS TO RECRUIT, TRAIN, AND COUNSEL QUALIFIED APPLICANTS. ALSO NEEDED ARE FULL EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION EFFORTS, AND A VARIETY OF CORRECTIVE MEASURES ON THE PART OF EDUCATORS, EMPLOYERS, UNIONS, CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS, AND GOVERNMENT. SOME SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS ARE INCLUDED. APPRENTICESHIP INFORMATION SOURCES ARE LISTED. COPIES OF THIS DOCUMENT ARE AVAILABLE FROM MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF MANPOWER POLICY, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, 14TH STREET AND CONSTITUTION AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410. (ET)

ED 015 944

NEGROES IN APPRENTICESHIP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR / Manpower Administration

MANPOWER/AUTOMATION RESEARCH MONOGRAPH No. 6

VT002353

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Manpower/Automation Research
Monograph No. 6

August 1967

NEGROES IN APPRENTICESHIP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Willard Wirtz, Secretary

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Manpower Administrator

PREFACE

This monograph is one of a series published by the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor on research conducted under title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. It is based on a study of "Negro Participation in Apprenticeship Programs" by Professors F. Ray Marshall and Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., conducted under Contract 81-46-66-01 with the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research (OMPER). The monograph was prepared in that office.

A book based on the full report--entitled *The Negro and Apprenticeship*--will be available in bookstores by early autumn. The book will also be available for inspection at regional offices of the Department. (Regional offices of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training are listed in the appendix to this monograph.)

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING	3
The Diagnosis and the Prescription	3
Characteristics of Apprenticeship	4
Apprenticeship Standards	5
Extent of Apprenticeship	6
THE ROOTS OF INEQUALITY	9
POLICIES TO EQUALIZE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY	11
Laws and Regulations	11
Other Equal Employment Policies	13
Union Policies	14
SOME WINS, SOME LOSSES	17
New York--A Measure of Success	17
The Workers Defense League	18
Union Activities	19
Washington, D.C.--Major Switch	21
San Francisco-Oakland--Exceptions to a Rule	22
BUILDING ON PROGRESS	25
Government Action	25
Other Recommendations	26
APPENDIX: Regional and Field Offices, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and Apprenticeship Information Centers.	29

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1965, concern over the small number of Negro workers in most of the skilled trades prompted the Department of Labor to finance an independent study of ways to increase Negro participation in apprenticeship. This decision reflected a fundamental belief that apprenticeship is a desirable form of training and that greater Negro participation is an essential social objective. The study, entitled "Negro Participation in Apprenticeship Programs," was prepared by Professors F. Ray Marshall and Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., both at the University of Texas at the time of the study.

Professors Marshall and Briggs studied apprenticeship programs in 10 large cities, most of which had experienced or been threatened with civil rights demonstrations against lack of Negro employment in the skilled trades, especially in the construction industry. The cities were New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Detroit, San Francisco-Oakland, Houston, Atlanta, and Washington.

In carrying out the study, investigators interviewed 121 officials of unions, civil rights groups, government agencies, and local Joint Apprentice Committees of employer and union representatives. They also interviewed 61 Negro apprentices and 66 Negroes whose applications were either still pending, or had been rejected or withdrawn, or who had dropped out after being accepted. They also held group discussions with Negro high school and college teachers, Negro college students, counselors, union representatives, joint employer-union groups, equal employment officials, and others. These interviews were supplemented by a review of other studies and investigations of apprenticeship and of the laws and regulations to which apprenticeship is subject.

This monograph is about some of the results of the Marshall-Briggs study with some updating and supplementing. It is not a complete summary of the study. Since its purpose is to foster action to afford fully equal opportunity in apprenticeship, it emphasizes those approaches to that goal which were found to be more successful. But where failures offer clues to more effective action, they are touched upon, too. The same selective treatment is given to the study's criticisms and recommendations.

A number of the report's recommendations have already occasioned action by the Department of Labor, and others are still being considered. These are discussed fully in the last section of this publication. (See pp. 26-27.) But many of the issues discussed in the report concern organizations and people over whom the Department has little influence. It is hoped that those concerned will find this monograph useful in deciding on their own response to a pressing problem of considerable national importance.

Some perspective on the problem is offered in the first portion of the monograph, which gives the essence of the relevant findings and recommendations and describes the nature and extent of apprenticeship. The second portion outlines the complex set of economic and social conditions responsible for the Negro's exclusion from apprenticeship. In the third portion, the policies adopted to equalize employment opportunity are discussed. Attempts to close the gap between policy and practice in several of the study cities are the subject of the next portion. The last portion reviews what has been done to improve the situation and suggests what else needs to be done and how it might be accomplished.

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

The Diagnosis and the Prescription

Although opportunities in apprenticeship programs are increasing for Negro youth, discrimination continues to be a problem in some programs in many parts of the country. When discrimination occurs, it is evident not only in the denial of entry but also in the refusal to reveal information about the programs and in the setting of unrealistic standards for admission. Nevertheless, once a Negro is accepted he experiences little if any discrimination.

Even where patterns of discrimination are crumbling--or where they never existed to begin with--attempts to increase participation have generally been disappointing. The Marshall-Briggs study concludes that the inadequate supply of Negroes who presently want to or can qualify for apprenticeship is, more than discrimination, the chief obstacle to wider participation. Because Negroes have been barred from the skilled trades, they know little of the nature and the promise of apprenticeship--a gap in their knowledge which many school counselors are either unable or unwilling to fill. Union admission fees, the cost of tools, and the comparatively low apprentice wage are also problems. And, in general, young Negro men who could qualify for apprenticeship prefer to go to college.

In city after city, following mass demonstrations against discrimination, civil rights leaders and officials of human rights commissions have failed to recruit more than a few nonwhite applicants who could pass fairly administered and objective apprenticeship examinations. These organizations have done little to screen out the unqualified or to prepare the recruits for entering and staying in apprenticeship, and they have placed very few applicants in apprenticeship programs.

The lack of response to mass recruiting drives and the generally poor performance of Negro youth on entrance tests, in turn, have been used by unions and employers to justify their lack of Negro participation. But experiences such as those in New York are demonstrating that qualified Negroes can be found and prepared for apprenticeship.

In New York, a private organization--the Workers Defense League--gathered information on apprenticeship programs in the area, visited schools, recruited Negro and Puerto Rican boys, counseled them, prepared them for the tests, and gave them other assistance. It chose graduates of academic high schools; vocational school graduates were too poorly educated to qualify, even with tutoring. The League has won the confidence of the unions, because it has sent only well-qualified youth who scored high on entrance tests and who understood apprenticeship. From the Marshall-Briggs findings it would appear that civil rights organizations would often be more effective in placing apprentices if they used this method, reserving demonstrations and other pressure tactics for the most unyielding instances of outright discrimination.

Other approaches, tried in other cities, have been less successful. These include the Apprenticeship Information Centers set up under the Department of Labor's auspices in major cities and preapprenticeship training

275-095 O - 67 - 2

under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) to help disadvantaged youth qualify for apprenticeship. Nevertheless, these approaches can be made more effective and are worth pursuing, in the opinion of Professors Marshall and Briggs.

Some of the most remarkable successes in opening up apprenticeship have followed voluntary action by employers and unions to comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the law. Marshall and Briggs feel that Federal emphasis should be on voluntary action, using sanctions as a last resort. However, they do recommend strong Federal and State action against those who do not comply with fair employment laws.

Characteristics of Apprenticeship

The Negro community and school officials seem to know very little about what apprenticeship is, how to get into it, and what kinds of careers it offers. Until recently, the employers and unions that train apprentices have not readily given out such information to any "outside" groups.

At least 350 occupations can be learned through apprenticeship, but many workers in these occupations learn the work in other ways. About two-thirds of the apprentices are training in the construction trades--as electrician, plumber, bricklayer, carpenter, sheetmetal worker, and the like. The second largest group of apprentices are in the metal trades in such occupations as machinist, tool and die maker, and welder. The printing trades provide the third major source of apprentice opportunities in such jobs as compositor and typesetter, pressman, and lithographer. Other occupations in which apprenticeship is important are utility lineman and serviceman, barber, and meatcutter. The kinds of occupations open to apprentices vary from city to city, depending on the kind of industry, the need for highly skilled workers, employers' policies on training, the amount of union organization, the employment situation, and other factors.

Entry into apprenticeship is frequently restricted to high school graduates of specified ages. Applicants also must often take a written test. The tests may cover mechanical aptitude as well as knowledge of mathematics, science, English, and so forth. In addition, the applicant will almost always be interviewed about such things as his interest in the trade, his attitude toward work, and whether his health and financial situation are such that he is likely to complete the program.

If he passes muster in the test and interview, the applicant will usually sign an indenture agreement which states both his employer's and his own obligations during the term of apprenticeship. The term is normally 4 years, but may range from 2 to 6 years, depending on the skills to be learned. During this time he will learn while earning through a systematic program of demonstration and supervised practice on the job. Typically, he will also receive off-the-job instruction in theory related to the particular craft. This instruction--usually a few hours a week--may be given during work hours or in the evening, and the employer sometimes pays the apprentice for these hours. Normally the instruction is given in a vocational school.

For apprentices who win journeymen's spurs, stable employment in high paying jobs and excellent opportunities for promotion are the usual reward. Earnings of $10,000 a year are not unusual for union journeymen in a number of trades. Moreover, one study reported that 19 percent of journeymen who completed apprenticeship became foremen or supervisors within 6 years, and that 8 percent went into business for themselves. The rate of upgrading is even greater in some trades, Marshall and Briggs report. "A skilled trades representative in the Detroit automobile industry said that 40 percent of their apprentice graduates wind up in managerial positions within 5 years, and a Houston electrical industry representative said that, within 2 years, 75 percent of the apprentice graduates in his craft in Houston enter managerial positions."

The apprentice who learns a variety of skills and masters the theoretical aspects of his trade is also considerably more flexible in the face of changes in the economy and in technology than a worker with narrow, specialized training. Moreover, he is guaranteed periodic wage increases during the term of his training, and when he completes it he is awarded a certificate as proof of his training--in effect, a gilt-edged reference wherever men of his trade are employed.

Because apprenticeship offers a method for tailoring skilled manpower to their needs, employers have a major stake in the program, particularly when the shortage of skilled manpower is growing. Large employers in high-wage industries are more likely than others to have apprentice programs because there is not as much chance that their skilled workers will leave for higher wages after they are trained.

Many unions regard apprenticeship as a means of giving their craft a standard of competence and protecting their wage rates. Apprenticeship also "makes it possible for the union to supply competent workers to maintain its jurisdiction. If the union acquires many unqualified or incompetent workers, the employer has a strong incentive to mechanize, become nonunion, or look elsewhere for his workers," Marshall and Briggs point out.

Apprenticeship also has advantages for the public. For one thing, it is much less costly to the taxpayers than most other kinds of vocational training. For example, a California official put the cost to the State of training an apprentice at $130 a year, compared with $1,900 a year per enrollee in a major California program under the MDTA.

The public interest in apprenticeship goes deeper than its cost, of course. Although apprenticeship is no longer so widely esteemed as it once was, it is still a major means of developing skilled craftsmen in certain important trades. Thus, a 1963 survey by the Department of Labor found that apprenticeship accounted for about two-fifths of all formal occupational training in the construction trades, about one-third of training as compositors and typesetters and machinists, and over half of that for meatcutters. Hence, it can be a key element of national manpower policy, even though its administration is largely the affair of unions and employers.

Apprenticeship Standards

A national apprenticeship policy was first established in 1937, when the National Apprenticeship (Fitzgerald) Act was passed. The law is administered by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT) in the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor. The BAT's headquarters are in Washington, D.C., and it has a field staff and offices in every State. (These are listed in the appendix at the back of this monograph for the convenience of readers who want more information about apprenticeship.)

The purposes of that law were to encourage the development of apprenticeship and to protect the welfare of apprentices. To achieve these aims, BAT assists employers and unions to set up apprenticeship programs and spreads information about apprenticeship through its field staff. It registers programs that meet standards established by management and labor and issues certificates to apprentices who successfully complete a registered program. In the latter activities, BAT works through State Apprenticeship Councils (SAC's) whose programs meet BAT standards, provided they are administered by the State labor department. There are 29 SAC States.

The apprenticeship standards issued by the Department of Labor are developed in consultation with the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship (FCA), which was set up 2 years before the Fitzgerald Act was enacted. This committee is composed of five representatives each from labor, management, and the U.S. Office of Education. In turn, the FCA consults extensively with State and local Joint Apprenticeship Committees (JAC's) for particular trades and industries and with the several national JAC's which exist in the building and printing trades. The JAC's are composed of equal numbers of employer and employee representatives chosen by their respective organizations. If, as sometimes happens, the employer has no union in its plant or has union approval to run its own program, then a company training director conducts the program. There are some 9,000 Joint Apprenticeship Committees throughout the Nation. Thus, the standards issued by the Department stem from the grass roots of the apprenticeship system.

These standards embody the minimum requirements for registration by BAT. The 29 SAC States impose additional, and sometimes more specific requirements for registration under State law. If apprentice programs meet these standards, they may be registered by either the BAT or the SAC. In October 1966, slightly more than three-fourths of the 40,000 registered programs were in SAC States.

Nothing in either the Fitzgerald Act or State apprenticeship laws requires programs to be registered, however. Sometimes employers do not register their programs because they are too limited to meet the prescribed standards; in other cases, they are reluctant to subject themselves to State or Federal regulations. It has been estimated that about one-fourth of all apprentices are in unregistered programs.

To be registered by BAT, programs must currently meet the following requirements:

--An apprentice starting age of at least 16.
--A schedule for both training and on-the-job experience.
--A course of off-the-job instruction of at least 144 hours a year in technical subjects related to the job.
--Progressive increases in wages.
--Adequate supervision of on-the-job training and adequate facilities for training.
--Periodic review of each apprentice's progress on the job and in class.
--Employee-employer cooperation.
--Recognition of successful completion.
--Nondiscrimination throughout all parts of the program.
--Fair and full opportunity to apply.
--Selection on the basis of ability only.

Within this broad framework, apprenticeship sponsors set the conditions of their own programs. They specify what qualifications apprentices must meet, how they will be selected, how many may be hired, what and how they will be taught and supervised, how long they must serve in apprenticeship, how much they will be paid, how many hours they will work, and the like.

The standards adopted in 1966 by the Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee to meet the nondiscrimination standards (the last three in the list above) illustrate how the procedure works. In issuing the standards, the committee, made up of representatives of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) and the National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), noted: "A unified industry position is necessary if we are to continue to operate our own programs."

The industry standards call for apprentices with a natural aptitude for using tools who are "gifted enough to master the intricacies of electrical science, [and] who can and will keep up with the progress of the industry. . . ." Candidates must be physically fit, between 18 and 24 years of age, and high school graduates.

All qualified applicants are to be interviewed by the local JAC. The local committee grades applicants on education (with extra credit for science and mathematics courses), marital status and dependents, financial condition, availability of transportation, and information brought out in the interview on character, judgment, and interest. The local committee is advised to probe whether the applicant regards apprenticeship as the start of a career. It is also advised to keep complete records on each applicant, and it must set up an appeals procedure for rejected applicants.

Some trades do not specify high school graduation, although a diploma usually carries extra credits. The Pittsburgh carpenters, for example, make such an allowance.

Extent of Apprenticeship

The number of apprentices that can be admitted to a particular program often depends on the apprentice-journeyman ratio (for example, one apprentice for every 10 journeymen) specified in the agreement between the employer and the union. The number actually admitted may fluctuate from year to year as the employment of journeymen expands or contracts with changes in the local or national economy, and with changes in technology which affect the demand for skilled workers. Only one registered program out of every six has five or more apprentices.

In 1966, about 85,000 new apprentices were registered in federally approved programs, and more than 26,000 apprentices completed their training. At the end of that year, nearly 208,000 apprentices were in various stages of training in registered programs. Even if allowance is made for

openings in unregistered programs, however, there are relatively few openings in any city at any given time.

Marshall and Briggs note that the "symbolic significance" of apprenticeship has "often obscured the quantitative importance to Negroes of the jobs they were likely to get through apprenticeship training." Granting the most equal opportunity possible, Negro youth might command between 5,000 and 10,000 additional skilled jobs annually through apprenticeship. Even these figures would appear to require at least some expansion of existing apprenticeship programs. Although these numbers in themselves are not large, they are significant when viewed against the limited representation of Negroes employed in highly skilled occupations.

They are also highly significant in the light of the number of Negro apprentices in recent years. In 1964, for example, a study of apprenticeship under Federal construction contracts showed the barest token compliance with nondiscrimination regulations. Of 21,500 apprentices employed on federally supported construction projects, 483 or 2.2 percent were Negro. Indeed, the 1960 census showed only 2,191 Negro apprentices in all trades throughout the country. That figure was one more than had been recorded in the 1950 census.

THE ROOTS OF INEQUALITY

Marshall and Briggs emphasize that while the reasons that so few Negroes take part in apprenticeship training "are easy to list, it is much more difficult to assign weights to each of the factors in the complex constellation of causes." They note that civil rights groups--often supported by antidiscrimination agencies--emphasize discrimination, while unions--often supported by apprenticeship agencies--stress the lack of qualified Negro youth.

Although the charges of discrimination single out different unions in different localities, virtually all of the building trades (except the trowel trades and the carpenters), the printing trades, and some of the mechanical trades in industrial plants have been cited in one or another investigation. Marshall and Briggs note that "there can be little question that racial prejudices and discrimination by unions and management (reflecting prevailing social attitudes) have been major reasons for the absence of Negroes from apprentice programs," even though "there have perhaps been some significant changes in attitudes in recent years."

While not denying the existence of discrimination, the AFL-CIO Department of Civil Rights asserts that the lack of qualified Negro and other minority youth represents the major problem. The arguments of the unions have been strengthened by the poor results of mass recruiting campaigns in certain northern cities in the early sixties. Marshall and Briggs note that "Civil rights and union leaders have been surprised at the apathy shown by Negro youngsters toward apprentice programs even when they had a chance to get in." The unions' position has been further strengthened by the lack of any significant number of complaints of discrimination filed with State and Federal agencies, although this may be due to ignorance of the law.

The long period of apprenticeship training leading to well-paid journeymen's jobs generally begins with a learning wage below the going rate for unskilled labor. This sometimes leads minority and other disadvantaged youth to look elsewhere because of the immediate need for higher earning power.

Moreover, because manual labor and menial tasks have so long been their lot, Negroes hold white-collar employment in especially high esteem. The Marshall-Briggs study notes that Negro youth who might successfully compete for apprenticeship places often go on to college, or seek white-collar jobs.

Educational and cultural disadvantages also exact a high toll of Negro youth seeking places in apprenticeship programs. Entry into many of the skilled trades, particularly in construction, has been based largely on the father-son tradition. More craftsmen with higher incomes are now sending their sons to college, however, and laws and regulations against discrimination and the spread of information about apprenticeship are also weakening the father-son apprentice relationship.

At the same time these developments have opened up apprenticeship opportunities, however, many of the crafts have stiffened their entrance requirements. Technological change has in some cases raised skill

requirements, and equal opportunity laws and regulations have led to more formal admission procedures.

While the number of Negro high school graduates is increasing, only 52 percent of the 25- to 29-year-old nonwhite men in the labor force in 1966 had finished high school, against 73 percent of the whites. This, alone, eliminates Negro youth from apprenticeship in trades which require a high school diploma.

"The fact is that the massive inefficiency of the public schools where the masses of Negroes go does the discriminating for any prejudiced employer, so that he doesn't have to do it himself," Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, former director of the Social Dynamics Institute of the City College of New York, points out.

"All he has to do is to maintain even minimum standards of qualifications in such basic subjects as reading or arithmetic, and as things now stand, the vast bulk of the Negro youngsters from the working class, the lower middle class, are unable to meet minimal standards for employment in other than menial lower status jobs."

JAC's have, when confronted with State and Federal equal employment opportunity laws, and ensuing regulations, responded with increased reliance upon objective tests. Civil rights organizations contend that objective testing discriminates because it is structured to middle-class white values. The hard fact that must be faced is that most Negro apprenticeship applicants achieve lower test scores than white applicants.

Marshall and Briggs point out that "these differential results are thought to reflect cultural or background differences. . . . Such tests therefore will not be accurate predictors of performance on the job or in the training program."

However, they found that "except in a few cases, the tests seem to have been fairly administered, but there is some question concerning the weight given certain parts of the tests, especially the heavy reliance on oral interviews."

Yet, "written tests are more likely to exclude Negroes than oral interviews." Oral testing is "flexible enough" to permit examiners to do as they please, and Negro youth "can be tutored to improve their chances of making good impressions in oral interviews." JAC's argue for interviews on the grounds that these alone can successfully reveal the true attitudes of applicants towards apprenticeship.

The performance of Negro youth on written tests, however, has been markedly improved in New York City and in Cleveland through the use of special tutorial classes. But while these prep sessions take time and effort by dedicated instructors, they have been rewarded for their work many times over.

Furthermore, Marshall and Briggs "are convinced that tests are less important than the attitudes of the people administering them. If apprentice sponsors want to take in qualified Negroes, they can use the tests to do so. Under present conditions, on the other hand, apprentice sponsors can and have used tests to bar Negroes."

POLICIES TO EQUALIZE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The first government actions to get more Negroes into apprenticeship centered on eliminating discrimination in employment, especially by unions. As it became clear that laws and regulations were a necessary but not a sufficient basis for attaining Negro participation in employment, more stress was put on programs concerned with the supply of applicants and encouraging voluntary efforts by employers and unions to equalize employment opportunity.

Laws and Regulations

Apprenticeship complaints under laws and ordinances outlawing discrimination in employment adopted by 26 States and many municipalities have not been a prominent issue. In New York, for example, State law forbids any employer, union, or employment agency to deny apprenticeship because of race, color, creed, or national origin, and a New York City ordinance outlaws discrimination on public construction by contractors or subcontractors. Yet the New York State Commission for Human Rights (formerly Commission Against Discrimination) had only three apprenticeship discrimination cases between 1946 and 1965. Lack of complaint has been attributed to ignorance of the law by a surprising number of Negro workers, and the feeling on the part of those who might protest that complaints will lead only to trouble.

Until the Civil Rights Act was passed in 1964, the Federal Government's antidiscrimination program centered on employers and unions dealing with the Government. Its fair employment activities were the result of a series of executive orders that go back to the early days of World War II. The most recent was issued in 1961, when President Kennedy created the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity (PCEEO) to secure compliance with the nondiscrimination clauses of Federal contracts. Later, it was assigned similar responsibility for construction projects where Federal funds were being used. Since unions were not parties to Federal contracts, the Committee's attempts to combat racism in unions were, perforce, indirect. In apprenticeship programs, it required contractors to comply with the BAT's regulations (described fully later) and stated that these regulations applied "to all the apprenticeship programs of a contractor" working on Federal projects, whether or not the programs were registered with BAT.

The PCEEO was also responsible for fair employment practices in the Government itself and for promoting voluntary action by private employers and unions to eliminate discrimination.

In 1965, following passage of the Civil Rights Act, the PCEEO was abolished. Its contract compliance functions were transferred to the Department of Labor, and the Civil Service Commission took over its Federal employment duties.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act makes it an unfair employment practice in industries affecting interstate commerce to discriminate because of race, color, creed, sex, or national origin. Initially it applied

275-095 O - 67 - 3

to employers or unions with 100 or more employees or members and to all unions that operate hiring halls. It is to be gradually extended to those with 25 or more by July 1968. Joint apprenticeship committees, unions, and employers are specifically prohibited from discriminating in apprenticeship and other training programs.

Enforcement of title VII is lodged in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), an independent Federal agency. EEOC must refer charges of violation of the law to State or local antidiscrimination agencies where they exist. It can investigate and try to settle the dispute only where there are no State and local agencies or where they could not resolve the issues. If the EEOC fails, the complaining individual may sue the alleged offender in Federal district court.

The EEOC may also call patterns of discrimination to the attention of the Attorney General, who may bring civil action if he has "reasonable cause" to believe a pattern of discrimination exists.

In the spring of 1967, the first suit alleging discrimination in an apprenticeship program under this provision was pending in Federal district court in San Francisco. (See p. 23.)

The spring of 1967 also brought action by the Department of Labor to enforce the compliance pledge that has been required since the Department's nondiscrimination regulations for registered apprenticeship programs went into effect in January 1964. On March 29, 1967, the Department notified the sponsors of some 600 registered programs in non-SAC States which were delinquent in filing the pledge that they faced deregistration proceedings if they failed to comply by April 10.

The Department's regulations (Code of Federal Regulations, 29 CFR Part 30) differ for programs registered before and after the effective date of January 17, 1964. Those registered before that date must provide for selection of apprentices on the basis of qualifications alone and nondiscrimination in all subsequent phases of apprenticeship and must end prior discriminatory employment patterns. Qualifications are to be determined by such means as "fair aptitude tests, school diplomas, age requirements, occupationally essential physical requirements, fair interviews, school grades, and previous work experience." The selection requirement may be satisfied, however, by either selecting from existing employees or "demonstrating equality of opportunity" in selection procedures. These two options are not available to programs registered after January 17, 1964.

The regulations are administered by BAT, which is required to review registered programs systematically for compliance. BAT may seek conciliation where it finds noncompliance and has the power to "deregister" programs refusing to comply. Program sponsors may also voluntarily cancel their registration at any time without sanction.

Marshall and Briggs report that following some initial resistance, all State programs complied within 18 months after publication of 29 CFR 30. They argue that few cases of noncompliance are to be expected, since Negroes may be barred without even twisting the law. Determination of qualifications, the nature of tests, and the interpretation of results remain the prerogatives of the JAC's.

In almost all cases, apprenticeship sponsors have been able to satisfy nondiscrimination requirements merely by formal declaration of intent to comply with 29 CFR 30. "No penalties," the Marshall-Briggs report notes, "have been imposed upon JAC's for failing to comply with these requirements or to make the reports which they require." As noted above, the first noncompliance proceedings have since been instituted.

Correctly or otherwise, civil rights leaders take a dim view of both BAT and State enforcement. Some have charged that testing and objective standards required by 29 CFR 30 have imposed new bars to Negro youth entry.

Despite their requirements for objective standards, the regulations have failed to increase Negro apprenticeship significantly in the skilled building trades and other crafts. Marshall and Briggs attribute this failure to weaknesses in the regulations, enforcement difficulties, and lack of programs to overcome cultural disadvantage.

The regulations nevertheless have had a discernible impact. Unions and employers now generally concede that change must come, although some remain determined to fight equal employment opportunity. Similarly, many of those who had contended that discrimination was the sole barrier to Negro

youth now are more aware that the job that must be done to get Negroes into apprenticeship goes beyond protest and the law.

Other Equal Employment Policies

During 1963, when it issued the nondiscrimination regulations for registered apprenticeship programs, the Department of Labor also took several other steps to promote Negro participation in apprenticeship. Although the Marshall-Briggs report criticizes the operation of some of these programs, it endorses the principles on which they are based and suggests ways of improving the programs.

The Department's actions necessarily reflect the circumstances under which they were taken. In the civil rights campaign against discrimination in employment during the early 1960's, the Department came in for its share of criticism. The racial position of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training was attacked by several organizations, including the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Against this background, two of the Department's 1963 measures centered on its own administration of apprenticeship and other on-the-job training activities.

The first of these came in February 1963 when the Secretary of Labor established an Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training (ACEOAT). At its 11th meeting, in October 1965, it recommended an eight-point program which emphasized promotional and informational activities. Three months later, the Committee defined four "specific, attainable goals for calendar year 1966": (1) having minority representation in *every* registered program; (2) maintaining or increasing existing minority representation; (3) launching affirmative action programs in pilot areas; and (4) applying sanctions in "specific instances [where] we have not achieved these goals." BAT did not accept the program, citing a number of reasons including inadequate funds and staff.

The Department's second 1963 innovation was the addition of four race relations consultants to the BAT's staff. These and others became industrial training advisors (ITA's) and were given the responsibility to open up greater apprenticeship opportunity to Negroes. Most ITA staff selected were Negroes, and BAT also named a Negro as director of its Chicago Regional Office--a "dramatic reversal of the BAT's traditional personnel policies."

Marshall and Briggs found that the ITA's in some of the study cities had been ineffectual and attributed this to lack of support from the BAT regional staff. In their review of the Chicago situation (which supplemented the studies in 10 cities), however, they found much to praise. Subsequently, the Chicago regional director of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training announced (on May 22, 1967) an increase of about 30 percent in the 1966 enrollment of apprentices in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. He continued:

"Chicago is the first major city in the Nation to have an integrated building construction apprenticeship program. Since December 1, 1965, 129 minority race members, mostly Negroes, have been placed into jobs as apprentices. The door is wide open for qualified applicants for these programs, regardless of race, color, creed, or religion. A full-scale recruitment program is under way to get more Negro men into these programs. Various civil rights organizations, especially the Urban League, have helped in getting Negroes to apply for apprenticeships."

Two other actions taken by the Department in 1963 were directly concerned with recruiting and preparing Negro and other minority youth for apprenticeship. These were the opening of the first Apprenticeship Information Centers (AIC) and approval of the first preapprenticeship training program under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Because it is the "Federal city," the first AIC was opened in Washington, D.C., as a cooperative venture of the D.C. Apprenticeship Council, the D.C. Commissioners, the U.S. Employment Service, and the U.S. Department of Labor. The center was hailed by the then Under Secretary of Labor as of "particular value to Negroes and other minorities from whom knowledge of admission procedures and requirements often has been withheld."

Soon after, Manpower Administration Order 12-63 called for federally supported AIC's in other major cities where apprenticeable trades are concentrated. They were to answer the "demonstrated need for providing

a central and easily accessible source of information, guidance, and counseling concerning apprenticeship opportunities, requirements, and enrollment." By mid-1967, there were 26 federally supported centers in operation. (See p. 29 for addresses.)

The BAT and the Bureau of Employment Security (BES) jointly control the AIC's. The centers are actually operated by the local office of the State Employment Service (ES), with assistance from BAT field staff. Each center has an Intergovernmental Agency Coordinating Group and a local advisory committee of labor, management, minority groups, and civil rights organizations.

AIC's are charged with maintaining up-to-date information on programs and making it available in their communities. They are called upon to promote cooperation among employers, unions, and minority groups to insure equal opportunity. They are directed to determine applicants' qualifications through interviews, counseling and testing, and to "refer only those qualified" to available openings.

This proviso aroused opposition to the formation of AIC's from labor, which expressed fear that the centers would usurp union rights in determining qualifications. In an effort to allay these fears, the Federal BES Administrator in March 1964 asked State ES agencies to notify unions that the AIC's would not attempt to "by-pass or disrupt the traditional prerogative and authority" of JAC's or other apprenticeship sponsors.

In fact, the AICs' main function is informational. They have no power to require apprentice sponsors to accept applicants they find qualified. Nor do they have any responsiblilty for helping applicants to qualify, although they may refer applicants to upgrading programs where they exist. Thus, their success cannot be measured solely on the basis of acceptance of their referrals. Experience would indicate that AIC's can be effective in recuitment, screening, and referral and that, where they produce enough qualified applicants, they have at least moderate success. The Marshall-Briggs report found that the AIC's in Washington, D.C., and Chicago were most productive of actual placements in apprentice slots.

Centers in other cities studied were far less successful. This unimpressive record is attributed by Marshall and Briggs to "opposition from the building trades unions . . . a lack of cooperation from the apprenticeship establishments and State Employment Services and the lack of imagination by some of the centers' directors."

Several Federal grants and contracts have been awarded under the Manpower Development and Training Act for preapprenticeship programs. In these programs, youths whose education would not qualify them for apprenticeship are given remedial instruction and skill training to overcome this disadvantage. Graduates of some of the programs are assured of job openings as apprentices.

The first of these programs was launched in May 1963 by the National Institute of Labor Education (NILE), under contract with the Department. Initially, the project--known as Training for Apprenticeship (TFA)--had both the moral and the financial support of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO. The first program, involving the Carpenters union in the District of Columbia, was widely acclaimed, and it was proposed that it be used as a model for other trades and other localities. Other unions, unprepared for the recommendation, soon began to criticize the project. They appeared to regard it as an intrusion by outsiders and to feel that the admission of school dropouts would lower the trade's prestige or that the dropouts "lacked the will and ability to learn." In late 1964, there was an unsuccessful attempt to get a formal endorsement of the project from the Executive Council of the Building and Construction Trades Department. Consequently, it was decided to drop the project. By the time it was terminated in June 1965, the Carpenters, Bricklayers, Painters, Auto Workers, Steel Workers, and Machinists had participated in programs which provided extensive training and schooling (usually 1 year) to some 600 youths. Thus, despite some unfortunate experiences, Marshall and Briggs found preapprenticeship programs an "effective means of both providing opportunities to [disadvanaged] youngsters and supplying qualified applicants to apprentice programs."

Union Policies

The national AFL-CIO has sought and sometimes obtained important compliance with equal opportunity requirements in apprenticeship and other employment situations.

It has been in the forefront of the fight for civil rights legislation, including fair and equal employment opportunity. State bodies, and some city bodies, have given effective support to similar State and local legislation. Such action has sometimes been taken in the face of strong membership opposition and of adverse local leadership attitudes. As Marshall and Briggs put it, "The AFL-CIO has adopted a strong antidiscrimination policy and, although any program can be improved, the federation seems to be actively doing what it can to implement that policy. The trouble with the AFL-CIO is that it has very limited power over the discriminating locals."

AFL-CIO apprenticeship policy was clearly spelled out in its 1961 convention civil rights policy resolution, which stated:

"We welcome. . . agreements [with employer associations] to make nondiscrimination on account of race, creed, color, and national origin a standard to be observed in all apprenticeship programs . . .

"We ask our affiliates to take initiative in a sustained effort to expand apprenticeship and training opportunities for all workers and, through joint apprenticeship committees in which they take part, insure that qualified applicants be accepted without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin."

SOME WINS, SOME LOSSES

In most of the 10 cities studied by Professors Marshall and Briggs, the enunciation of a fair employment policy in apprenticeship did not result in significant increases in the number of Negro apprentices, particularly in the building trades. The specifics differed from city to city, of course, and generalizations are hard to make. But with few exceptions, the story ends where it should begin--with token participation at best. Between the beginning and the end lie the dreary recitations of the almost universal failure of recruiting drives, the lack of programs to prepare Negro youth for entry into the skilled trades, and the lackadaisical attempts to gather and distribute information about specific apprentice programs in the face of frequent opposition from program sponsors. In this monograph San Francisco was selected to illustrate the problems; it does not necessarily typify them.

The New York and the Washington stories, however, end on a more optimistic note. For this reason, they are presented here in some detail. Their selection is not to be interpreted as a writing off of an occasional promising development of a similar nature elsewhere. Rather, it reflects a desire for brevity in revealing the essence of the approaches which seem more successful.

New York–A Measure of Success

In New York City, Negroes have made significant breakthroughs in apprentice programs where "lily white" rules prevailed only 5 years ago. Remedial action was found by Marshall and Briggs to have been "far more extensive and unusual than in any of our other study cities. Significantly . . . although the issue has been in the public spotlight and frequently has involved public agencies, the greatest strides toward resolution have come from private activities."

The issue of discrimination in the building trades came to a climax in New York in the summer of 1963. Civil rights groups staged mass demonstrations in an attempt to shut down all publicly aided construction until 25 percent of the jobs were filled by Negroes and Puerto Ricans. (In 1960, Negroes held less than 8 percent of the city's 190,000 construction jobs, working almost entirely as laborers or on nonunion projects. At that time, 12.4 percent of the city's labor force was nonwhite.)

When the demonstrations continued for 2 months despite hundreds of arrests, the City, the State, and the local building trades unions launched a massive campaign to recruit and refer minority group members for construction employment. The leader in this attempt was a bi-racial committee named by the New York City Building and Construction Trades Council of the AFL-CIO. This committee interviewed and screened applicants referred by the Employment Service, civil rights groups, and special recruiting organizations set up by the State and City. Only Negroes and Puerto Ricans who had lived in New York for at least 2 years were eligible.

Despite widely broadcast appeals, the number of qualified applicants was disappointing. Only 1,600 applied for apprenticeship,

and nearly two-thirds of these were not residents of New York, were too young or too old, lacked even minimum education, or failed to show up for an interview with the committee.

The final results were even more disappointing. For example, the Carpenters union accepted 43 of the 135 apprentice applicants referred to it, but only 6 of the applicants actually reported to the union and accepted membership.

"We had been led to believe," the biracial committee reported, "that there were thousands who couldn't gain admittance into the building trades unions. . . . we felt that the numbers who came forward were small and those qualified were even smaller in number. . . . One of the greatest eye openers . . . was the apparent abandoning of many youths in our school system. . . . the committee was shocked that boys who were graduates of our vocational high schools . . . could not spell such words as 'brick' . . . or . . . add inches and feet."

The Workers Defense League

Formed as a human rights organization before World War II, the Workers Defense League (WDL) moved into the apprenticeship struggle when it took part in the 1963 demonstrations. The League soon realized that enough qualified minority youth could not be produced even if apprentice vacancies were opened up to them.

The League's first reaction was to start on a quest for information about entry requirements for apprenticeship programs. The result was a widely distributed pamphlet listing 3,000 apprentice openings in the New York area, explaining the trades, and giving specific information on what qualifications were needed and where and how to apply.

With a small grant from the Taconic Foundation, the WDL expanded its apprentice program to recruiting activities. It hired an employment specialist to head the program and began operations in a store-front office in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn in June 1964. Starting from scratch, it set up communications with community organizations, the antipoverty program, and schools. Potential apprentices were sought out at home, and there were large mailings.

The WDL soon found that it had to screen out unqualified applicants, including most on long lists supplied by vocational schools. It now uses more selective recruiting methods to find nonwhite youth who have a better chance of entering a highly competitive area, and all recruits are given the Otis Quick Scoring Test of Mental Ability.

The recruits who decide to try for apprenticeship also receive tutoring; help in finding temporary jobs, filling out application forms, locating school transcripts; counseling; loans for application and initiation fees; and sometimes medical examinations. Major sources of temporary jobs, which some applicants need while they are waiting for completion of the lengthy union screening process, have been the International Ladies' Garment Workers', the Drug and Clerks Union, other unions, and the Employment Service. A group of dedicated Western Electric employees has volunteered much needed tutoring assistance.

The WDL began its tutoring activities in 1964, after the State Supreme Court found the father-son apprentice system of Sheet Metal Workers' Local 28 "illegal and unconstitutional." The court ordered the local to hold an open examination for its 65 apprentice vacancies. There were 340 applicants for this examination, which was held in February 1965. The applicants included 50 Negroes and Puerto Ricans, of whom 28 were WDL recruits. The WDL recruits were tutored for 4 weeks in vocabulary and mathematics. The highest score for any WDL recruit was made by the brother of the WDL's assistant apprenticeship director, who placed 68th. After three ranking whites dropped out, he became the first Negro apprentice in the 77-year history of Local 28.

On the second open Sheet Metal examination, in November 1965, 12 of the 25 applicants sent by WDL placed among the top 30. For 7 1/2 hours a week in the 2 months before the exam, they were tutored to pass a specific test (rather than receiving general instruction). Those who passed were prepared for the oral interviews by WDL staff members.

The results of the third Local 28 examination, in November 1966, brought out even more clearly the WDL's success in helping Negroes pass the required tests. The WDL staff tutored a student body of 32 for 18 hours a

week during the 4 weeks before the examination. One WDL Negro applicant scored 100 percent; 12 were among the highest 15 scorers. Only 36 of the 118 white candidates passed; 24 of the 32 Negroes did.

This tutoring class was run by Dennis Derryck, a talented teacher who had been highly successful with disadvantaged children in the Yonkers school system and whom Dr. Clark had persuaded to join the WDL program in mid-1966. "Of course," Derryck explains, "we couldn't use the test they would use. But there are only four or five areas where you can test for mechanical aptitudes. My old roommate who teaches physics at Stanford studied the tests we could find and told me what the kids needed to learn. So we taught levers and pulleys. In mathematics, we were able to get it down to certain concepts and ideas."

The president of Local 28 attributed the test results to "some nefarious means" employed by the WDL. He was joined in calling for new tests by the professor who had administered the tests through the New York University Testing Service. This professor said he had never seen so many near-perfect scores--a result which he said should be "reported for history in the education journals." The State Commission for Human Rights challenged the order for new tests, and the New York State Supreme Court in February 1967 held the test scores valid, and in no way the result of any "nefarious" scheme. Speaking for the court, Justice William C. Hecht said:

"The expectation that applicants will come to an aptitude test totally unaware of the mysteries which await them is, in this test-conscious, test-saturated world . . . a perhaps noble but indeed naive wish. . . . If the applicants were given simply another version of the published standardized test, there is no reason to believe, on evidence submitted, that the results would be significantly different."

The WDL was less successful in attempts to get its recruits into the 1966 class of apprentices for Plumbers Local 1. One of the union's requirements was a 75 percent average in the senior year of high school--a requirement which none of the applicants referred by WDL could meet. After appealing unsuccessfully to the union to change the rule, which it claimed was arbitrary, the WDL managed to get the United Federation of Teachers to have the grades adjusted for three of the applicants so they would have a 75 percent average. These three took the test and placed third, fourth, and 19th out of 50 people taking the exam for 20 apprentice openings. Nevertheless, the union refused to appoint the WDL applicants to the apprentice class because they did not score in the 30th percentile in each of the test's five sections and because it claimed it had not received official notice of the change in their school grades.

Aside from these union challenges of its tactics, WDL's success has depended heavily on its concerted efforts to gain the confidence of local union leaders and to ease their fears. "It is our impression," the WDL reported in 1966, "that some trade unionists who now realize that their unions must be integrated are relieved to discover a responsible and reliable source with which to work." The Marshall-Briggs report finds that by "unwritten consent" the WDL has become the chief referral center for minority youth seeking apprenticeship.

By the end of 1966, the WDL had brought about 100 Negro and Puerto Rican youth into New York City apprentice jobs. So promising were its experiments that the Department of Labor in February 1967 signed a 2-year contract with the Workers Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Education Trust to develop apprentice opportunities for 375 disadvantaged youth in New York City, Westchester County (N.Y.), Buffalo, and Cleveland. (For further details, see p. 18.)

Union Activities

Union attitudes toward equal employment opportunities in New York offer sharp contrasts. Two unions--Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) and Local 6 of the International Typographical Union (ITU)--provide outstanding examples of voluntary efforts to open up apprenticeship. Local 1 of the Plumbers union, on the other hand, has been accused of resisting the admittance of Negroes, as indicated above, and its sister Local 2 figured in headline incidents in 1964 and 1966.

IBEW Local 3 had been a craft union, with a father-son apprentice tradition until the fifties, when it began to organize industrial

workers. By 1961, two-thirds of its 34,000 members were industrial workers, including 4,500 Negroes and Puerto Ricans. In that year, after Local 3 had opened its apprenticeship programs to the sons of industrial worker members, the first Negro was graduated from the union's 5-year apprentice program.

When Local 3 negotiated a 25-hour workweek for journeymen electricians in 1962, it pledged to increase the supply of journeymen and apprentices. It followed up by sending 2,000 letters asking for applications from sons of industrial members, civil rights groups, employers, vocational high schools, and the like. It received 1,600 applications.

An impartial committee screened all applicants, employing objective standards, including high school graduation, desire to go to college, and age 18 to 21. No written tests were given. (Local 3 introduced tests in 1966 to comply with an agreement with the City Commission on Human Rights that all unions would give open tests for apprenticeship.)

Of the 1,020 trainees entering Local 3's 1962 apprenticeship class, 240 were Negro and 60 were Puerto Rican. While the nonwhite dropout rate has been considerably higher than the IBEW's national average of 5 percent, a significant number of nonwhite apprentices will complete training in 1967.

After the State Commission Against Discrimination found in 1960 that patterns of discrimination existed in the printing trades, except in the Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, Local 6 of the ITU worked out a procedure for objective standards which is fully consistent with the New York antidiscrimination law.

The procedure, specified in 1962 and 1963 contract negotiations, provided for selection from a pool of about 1,000 utility workers in printing shops, of whom some 400 were nonwhite. It called for advance announcement of the number of apprentices to be admitted and for advance distribution of sample examinations.

Aptitude testing and interviewing were to be performed by the Employment Service, and tests on reading, spelling, grammar, mathematics, and knowledge of the trade were to be given by the New York School of Printing. Credit was included for length of service, and an appeals procedure was established.

Scoring of the aptitude tests and interview was to be on an all or nothing basis--either zero or 40 points. Applicants who did poorly on the test but well in the interview could be awarded the entire credit. Similarly, the language tests would count for either zero or 10 points. Actual scores were to be used on the arithmetic test (up to 30 points) and on trade knowledge (up to 20 points). On the first examination under the new procedure in October 1964, testing and scoring were done by a Columbia University professor.

Greater weight was given to arithmetic than language skills to reduce the obstacles for the culturally disadvantaged. Ironically, although 36 of the 350 who took the first test were Negroes or Puerto Ricans, only three of them passed. Nearly half of the 250 who took a subsequent test in the spring of 1966 were from minority groups, but only 12 Negroes passed.

Nevertheless, Marshall and Briggs note that "the opportunity to be considered for an apprentice program, a voluntary program of tutoring, and an impartially administered and graded examination procedure affords nonwhites a chance to qualify for admission that is absent in all other survey cities."

In sharp contrast to both IBEW Local 3 and ITU Local 6, Plumbers Local 2 was singled out for investigation by the City Commission on Human Rights (CCHR) in 1966 as the only construction apprentice program of the 106 in the city which was not in compliance with the State's apprenticeship standards.

This is the local whose members struck a city construction project for 2 1/2 weeks in 1964 after a contractor honored his agreement with the CCHR by hiring one Negro and three Puerto Rican plumbers who were not union members. After mediation attempts by both the Secretary of Labor and the president of the AFL-CIO, the Mayor announced that Local 2 would admit the four plumbers immediately as journeymen if they passed its test. Three of the four ultimately took the test, but they failed and were denied entry. Thereupon, they filed charges against the union with the National Labor Relations Board. The Board subsequently found that Local 2 had no right to refuse to work with nonunion men who were willing to join the union under a union-shop agreement. It also

held that the union could not base admission standards solely on its own particular test of competence. A spokesman for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People heralded the June 1965 decision as "a real breakthrough against the discriminatory practices of unions." But, as noted above, the CCHR was investigating the local's apprenticeship practices a year later.

On the whole, however, Marshall and Briggs found New York "a ray of light in an otherwise foggy area of national concern . . . in no other city have the divergent forces worked together so successfully. . ."

Washington, D.C. – Major Switch

Washington is unique among the cities studied. The city is predominantly Negro, and construction, especially Federal projects, accounts for an unusually large share of its industry. These facts help explain the city's significant progress in Negro apprenticeship, compared with many other cities where schools and public accommodations were desegregated much earlier than in Washington. Another distinguishing feature of the Washington story is an outstanding apprenticeship information center.

Washington has a greater proportion of Negroes than any other city. Nonwhites now total about 60 percent of the inner city's population. About 90 percent of Washington public school pupils are Negro.

Second only to Government, construction is Washington's major industry. While almost all Federal and commercial construction is union, a union-built house is a rarity in the metropolitan area. Nearly 30 percent of construction workers in 1960 were Negro, almost all employed in the nonunion sector where apprenticeship is virtually nonexistent. The best paid jobs are in the union sector.

Discrimination in the construction industry began to break down in 1960, after IBEW Local 26 refused to work with Negroes. When the national AFL-CIO proposed recruitment of nonunion Negroes to break the race barrier, plans to employ nonunion electricians on Federal projects were announced. Local 26 thereupon issued a work permit for a Negro journeyman, and in 1965, had nine Negro youth among its 180 apprentices.

Because it is the Federal city, Washington's is the only AIC fully manned by Federal employees. Its experience offers evidence of the worth of an effectively operated center.

The Washington AIC has been a major channel for screening and referral. During its first 3 years of operation, over 70 percent of the 5,522 applicants were Negro. Of 1,679 applicants referred to apprentice programs, 1,150 were Negro. Of the 609 placed in union programs, 403 were Negro. While there was entry into the plumbers, steamfitters, and other skills, the number of Negroes in these was disproportionately small.

By late 1965, more than 10 percent of Washington's 1,853 apprentices were Negro. When in 1966 the Sheet Metal Workers' admitted a Negro apprentice, all building trades locals with apprenticeship opportunities had made them available to Negroes. By early 1967, BAT reported that 19 percent of 2,100 apprentices were Negro.

An internal AFL-CIO Department of Civil Rights memorandum describes a meeting of the D.C. Apprenticeship Council with school counselors on January 10, 1967. About 150 counselors were present for workshops conducted by members of the electricians, plumbers, and carpenters JAC's.

The AFL-CIO inhouse memo reported: "Armstrong of the UA (Plumbers) told the counselors that they need apprentices, and it doesn't matter what they look like as long as they are qualified. Information outlining qualifications was distributed. He (Armstrong) told the counselors that USES administered the aptitude tests and to send the kids there . . . Presently in the plumbers there are four Negroes in their fourth year, four in the third, three in the second and five in the first. . ."

Washington AIC representatives announced their readiness to establish workshops for the schools, and a union representative stated that there is no objection to tutoring classes.

Despite earlier problems with the NILE program (see p. 14), a representative of the carpenters "envisioned" a new preapprenticeship program in the near future. This spokesman stressed that his trade does not require a high school diploma.

As a result of such developments, Marshall and Briggs observe, the apprenticeship question is not now given high

priority by the civil rights groups in Washington.

San Francisco-Oakland--Exceptions to a Rule

"The San Francisco Bay Area is heralded throughout the United States for its accessibility and openness to outsiders. But if it takes an exception to prove a rule, the apprenticeship question is certainly that exception. In no city has information been more difficult to gather. The impasse . . . is by no means limited to our study. It is denied, it seems, to all. The sole possessor of the data needed to evaluate the prevailing picture--the State Division of Apprenticeship Standards--possibly . . . has not been sufficiently pressured . . . to release the information," Marshall and Briggs observe.

Not that San Francisco has not had its share of civil rights demonstrations. About three-tenths of San Francisco's 800,000 people are Negroes, Mexican-Americans and Orientals, and one-fourth of Oakland's 400,000 population is Negro. Economic conditions are particularly bad among Negroes, who in 1960 had only 6 percent of the jobs in the area.

The San Francisco Archdiocesan Catholic Interracial Council has been the most active agency in pressing for equal employment opportunity. In 1965, it charged that the plumbers, ironworkers, sheet metal workers, IBEW, glaziers, operating engineers, and teamsters had "stubbornly refused to take any meaningful action to eliminate discrimination." It later enlarged charges to include construction contractors, the California Apprenticeship Council, the JAC's, and the California Division of Apprenticeship Standards. During a subsequent Fair Employment Practices Commission investigation (ultimately dropped for lack of specific complaints), an agency spokesman reported that dealing with the unions was its "toughest problem."

California has also had its share of equal opportunity programs. The State apprenticeship council approved an equality proposal as far back as 1957. In 1960, it called the first statewide conference of apprenticeship committees--the California Conference on Apprenticeship (CCA), which set up the Statewide Committee for Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training for Minority Groups. A third CCA meeting in 1964 had placed before it a resolution to expand apprenticeship and to "effectuate every possible means to insure fair and equal opportunity to qualified minority youth," after hearing that all was not well.

Only 200 of the 400 delegates at the meeting were present when the vote was taken near the end of the conference. A caucus formed the night previously by building trades union leaders forced the tabling of the resolution--partly because of racism and partly because they opposed "outside interference" in apprentice programs.

Another equality action by the California Conference on Apprenticeship came in 1960 when it endorsed a proposal of the Bay Area Urban League to set up a clearinghouse for the dissemination of apprenticeship information among minorities. At the urging of the conference, the State set up a pilot program in Fresno and one in San Francisco in 1963. In 1964, the State legislature appropriated funds to establish information centers in the major California cities. (Hence, the U.S. Department of Labor has not supported any AIC's in California.) A study of the San Francisco AIC in 1965 by the California Employment Service found that it had placed only six youth in apprenticeship in 2 1/2 years "to the best of our knowledge." It is not known whether any of those placed were Negroes.

In fact, as indicated earlier, it is almost impossible to tell in what trades Negroes are serving as apprentices in the Bay area. Although the State Division of Apprenticeship Standards has made three surveys, it has never released area data for specific trades. Its 1965 study showed some 45 Negroes among the 1,240 apprentices in San Francisco. During the field work for the Marshall-Briggs study, it was determined that 18 Negro apprentices were in the carpenters union, 14 in the cement masons, two in the plumbers, and four in the machinists.

Two developments in 1966 raised hopes that they would lead to serious attempts to seek out, to tutor, and to get Negroes accepted into apprenticeship. The Job Opportunities Bay Area Rapid Transit Committee--formed by civil rights and religious groups--undertook to equip local workers to qualify for employment on the project for building a tunnel under the Bay. In addition, expansion

of the Oakland Adult Minority Project was planned to help Negroes qualify for jobs on an urban renewal project financed by the Economic Development Administration in Oakland.

The hopes for these programs were still largely unrealized when the U.S. Civil Rights Commission held hearings in San Francisco in May 1967. Indeed, B. R. Stokes, general manager of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District, told the Commission that although he had "high hopes" that affirmative action would lead to more jobs for minority workers on the tunnel construction project, he did not foresee "very much change in the usual pattern of employment" as long as jobs in the construction industry were as scarce as they seemed to be currently.

At the same hearing, the president of the AFL-CIO Building Trades Council of Alameda County apparently summed up the union attitude: "Why do we want to attract people to jobs we don't have? We actively discourage anybody from joining apprenticeship programs."

A few days later, it was disclosed that Local 38 of the Plumbers union in San Francisco faced a suit initiated in January by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission charging an overall pattern of discrimination in its apprenticeship program. The local's business manager had testified at the Civil Rights Commission's hearings that the local had "never discriminated" and said that it had about 20 Negro members and 3 Negro apprentices, besides some 200 Spanish-speaking and 16 Oriental members. Acknowledging that these numbers are relatively small, the local's response to the EEOC suit insists that this is not due to discrimination. Its major challenge is that the complaint is "too broad and too vague" since it does not name specific instances of discrimination.

Professors Marshall and Briggs sum up the situation in San Francisco as follows: "For an area its size, there is an amazing lack of organized concern over Negro participation in the apprenticeable trades. . . . Until such time as [machinery tailor-made to the apprenticeship issue is established,] little will change and no one should be surprised or complain over the low participation figures."

BUILDING ON PROGRESS

In capsule form, the evidence of the Marshall-Briggs study is that while racial discrimination continues to be an important problem in apprenticeship programs, it is a less important barrier to Negro entry than the lack of efforts to recruit, train, and counsel qualified applicants. Another essential that is lacking is information on apprenticeship--in general and in particular trades in specific cities.

If more Negroes and other minority youth are to get into apprenticeship, healthy employment conditions are required, especially in the industries where apprentices are used. Full employment alone will not solve the problem fast enough, however. Intensified efforts to develop human resources and to improve education for disadvantaged youngsters are further requisites.

Beyond these general policies, action to increase the number of Negro apprentices calls for the cooperation--and sometimes the conflict--of a variety of governmental and private agencies, the study notes. It suggests specific steps that educators, employers, unions, civil rights groups, and various levels of government might take.

Government Action

In the government sphere, Marshall and Briggs outline "a logical . . . division of labor," with city governments having "primary responsibility . . . in the construction industry, because of the local nature of the market and the structure of the unions. In manufacturing industries with broader markets and different structures, State and Federal agencies should play a larger role. [They should also stand ready] to intervene . . . in the construction industry [where] city governments might be paralyzed by local political situations . . ."

Since the Marshall-Briggs report was completed, the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies have taken a number of actions along the recommended lines. Although some of these have been mentioned previously, they deserve elaboration.

The outcome of the BAT's warning to sponsors of some 600 apprentice programs that they faced deregistration proceedings unless they filed the nondiscrimination pledge required by the 29 CFR 30 regulations (See p. 12) remains to be seen. It does, however, signify the Department's intention to "have an affirmative, active compliance program."

There is no precedent for gaging the full consequences which might follow deregistration. Under the Davis-Bacon Act, it could mean that employers working on Federal projects would have to pay full journeymen's wages--instead of lower apprentice rates--to any apprentices employed on that work.

The BAT also announced that those programs which are found not to comply with the regulations will be reported to the Department's Office of Federal Contract Compliance and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Presumably these agencies would then investigate whether the program's sponsors are violating the regulations and legislation for which they have responsibility.

The EEOC has already initiated court action against Plumbers Local 38 in San Francisco (See p. 23)--the first formal charges of discrimination in an apprenticeship program. Regardless of its outcome, this action may set in motion the forces necessary to overcome the "lack of concern" which Marshall and Briggs found in the Bay area.

EEOC moved on another front by announcing, in February, its intention to require regular reports on employment in apprentice programs. While the proposed reporting form is designed to permit checking compliance with the statutory requirements, it would also yield a gold mine of hitherto unavailable information about the extent and characteristics of apprenticeship throughout the country.

The most significant Government action to prepare minority youth for apprenticeship came in February 1967, when the Labor Department contracted with the Workers Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Educational Trust to extend the League's activities to Buffalo, Cleveland, and Westchester County, N.Y., and step up its program in New York City. The League had previously received a modest grant from the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training to maintain its New York City work, and the new contract provides an additional $277,688. The goal is to place 375 disadvantaged youth in apprenticeship. To do this, the plan is to recruit, test, counsel, and screen 1,000 in each area. Medical examinations and family counseling will be given as needed. Those who fail to qualify for apprenticeship will be referred to other jobs or training opportunities. Apprenticeship candidates will be tutored intensively over a 3- to 6-week period, depending upon individual circumstances. Mock interviews will be conducted and followup services provided.

A unique feature of the project is the establishment of a national advisory council, which will include a cross-section of labor leaders. The project's leaders will seek maximum cooperation from Apprentice Information Centers, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and State Employment Services. (In this connection, the New York State Department of Labor in May announced the opening of Apprenticeship Information Centers in Buffalo and New York City, where the center set up in 1962 by the City Department of Labor was judged ineffectual by Marshall and Briggs.) A handbook on apprenticeships in each area will be prepared.

Plans for the project call for developing a list of 500 individuals, community organizations, churches, block associations, and other potential sources of applicants. There are to be poster campaigns and extensive mailings to secure general acceptance, and at least one city wide career conference devoted exclusively to apprenticeship. Field representatives will visit each high school with a high proportion of minority students and field offices will be set up in areas with large Negro and Puerto Rican populations.

The preapprenticeship approach to preparing minority youth for apprenticeship is being taken in a number of training and experimental and demonstration projects approved by the Department of Labor under the Manpower Development and Training Act. The ultimate aim of these programs is of course to get the young trainees into apprenticeship, but knowledge acquired in the process can lay the groundwork for educational programs to gain broader acceptance of the programs by the skilled trades.

Many Department of Labor programs are contibuting to closing the information gap which Professors Marshall and Briggs found. The preparation of this pamphlet is one illustration, as are the plans for publication of the Marshall-Briggs report outlined in the preface of this pamphlet. Others include a booklet giving specific information on all apprentice openings in the State of Iowa, prepared by the Iowa State Manpower Development Council as a part of an MDTA experimental and demonstration project. Both the Bureau of Employment Security and the Bureau of Labor Statistics are taking special pains to see that their publications for school and employment counselors contain realistic appraisals of apprenticeship opportunities, especially for minority youth. More actively, the BES and the BAT are taking steps, through the responsible State Employment Service, to insure efficient operation of the apprenticeship information centers.

Other Recommendations

The Department has been supplementing its own activities with vigorous attempts to persuade other organizations to act on the

recommendations made by Professors Marshall and Briggs. These recommendations call for:

1. A strengthening of Federal and State antidiscrimination measures to bring swift action against offenders--preferably fines, injunctions, denial of the use of public school for related training, etc. Emphasis, however, should be on voluntary compliance; sanctions should be imposed only as a last resort. Sponsors should be assured that they will retain control of determining qualifications unless the qualifications are used for discriminatory purposes.

2. Federal encouragement of voluntary nondiscrimination programs by unions and employers.

3. Specialized programs to overcome general educational disadvantages, and preapprenticeship programs to increase the supply of qualified Negroes. Some of the Job Corps programs should be oriented in this direction.

4. Summer jobs for minority youngsters in industries with apprenticeable trades to acquaint them with the trades and working conditions.

5. Development of a job ladder from the crafts to related supervisory and professional jobs, so as to raise the status of the crafts.

6. Increased role for municipal governments and their agencies in promoting apprenticeship for minorities, since the racial situation varies by city and apprenticeship programs and the construction industry are also peculiarly local in nature.

Specifically a city should:

a. Create a city human relations agency, if none exists, with adequate support from city officials;
b. carefully study the extent of Negro participation in apprenticeship programs and attempt to ascertain the reasons for their absence, where this situation exists;
c. withhold city funds from building projects which exclude qualified Negroes;
d. maintain relations with the Negro community and provide realistic information on the advantages and limitations of apprenticeship training as a means of getting jobs for Negroes;
e. provide realistic counseling in the city schools;
f. deny the use of public schools to discriminating apprentice programs;
g. provide remedial classes and not permit the use of vocational education classes as a dumping ground for poor students;
h. encourage MDTA, manpower and poverty, Office of Economic Opportunity, and Economic Development Administration, and other programs designed to prepare interested Negro youth to enter apprentice programs;
i. provide mediation facilities between unions, employers, joint apprentice programs, and the Negro community;
j. obtain help from the AFL-CIO Civil Rights Department, international officers of unions operating in the city, industry associations, organizations like the Construction Industry Joint Council, State and Federal antidiscrimination agencies, and perhaps the National Labor Relations Board;
k. follow up the results of actions taken to get Negroes admitted to apprenticeship programs.

7. Employers should see that testing and other selection procedures are not unnecessarily restrictive to minorities and they should work with civil rights organizations to recruit Negroes;

8. International unions should proceed vigorously through trusteeship against locals which are the worst offenders in discrimination;

9. Local unions should:
   a. Have material available on their programs and publicize their willingness to take Negroes;
   b. see that tests are fair and realistic;
   c. provide for outside observers and for appeals proceedings;
   d. seek out qualified Negro apprenticeship applicants.

10. Civil rights organizations should work with the Negro community to produce qualified applicants, and improve information and counseling. They should try to work out problems with human relations agencies, companies, employers' associations and unions, applying pressure only where facts warrant it.

APPENDIX

Regional and Field Offices, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and Apprenticeship Information Centers

State and City	*Address*	*Type of Office (Field, Regional, AIC)*
ALABAMA		
Birmingham	1931 Ninth Avenue, South, South Twentieth Building	Field
	1816 Eighth Avenue, North	AIC
Mobile	324 Federal Building	Field
Montgomery	474 South Court Street, 119 Aronov Building	Field
ALASKA		
Anchorage	Room 46, Post Office Building	Field
ARIZONA		
Phoenix	Room 2016, 1330 North Fourth Street, Federal Building	Field
Tucson	130 South Scott Avenue	Field
ARKANSAS		
Little Rock	700 West Capital Avenue, 3006 Federal Building	Field
CALIFORNIA		
Los Angeles	Room 7634, 300 North Los Angeles Street	Field
Oakland	354 21st Street, 201 The Penn Building	Field
Sacramento	Eighth and Eye Streets, Room 213	Field
San Diego	1927 Fifth Avenue, 206 Mony Building	Field

State and City	*Address*	*Type of Office (Field, Regional, AIC)*
CALIFORNIA (cont'd.)		
San Francisco	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Room 10457	Field
	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Room 10451	Regional (Arizona, California, Nevada, Hawaii)
COLORADO		
Denver	730 17th Street, 830 Equitable Building	Field
	721 19th Street, 314 New Custom House	Regional (Colorado, Montana, Utah Wyoming)
Pueblo	Fifth and Main Streets, 206 Post Office Building	Field
CONNECTICUT		
Bridgeport	83 Fairfield Avenue, Room 217	Field
	753 Fairfield Avenue	AIC
Hartford	135 High Street, 303 Post Office Building	Field
New Haven	640 Chapel Street, State-Federal Building	Field
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1145 19th Street, N.W., Room 319	Field
	555 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.	AIC
DELAWARE		
Wilmington	Room 321, Post Office Building	Field
FLORIDA		
Jacksonville	411 West Adams Street, 311 Fidelity Federal Building	Field
Miami	51 SW. First Avenue, Room 1531	Field
Orlando	2520 North Orange Avenue, 220 Executive Building	Field
Tallahassee	1309 Thomasville Road, 202 Tallahassee Building	Field
Tampa	500 Zack Street, 324 Federal Building	Field
GEORGIA		
Atlanta	1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Room 725	Field
	1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Room 729	Regional (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee)

Columbus	2210 Wynnton Road, 126 Wynnton Building	Field
Savannah	236 Post Office Building	Field
HAWAII		
Honolulu	1833 Kalakaua Avenue, Room 618	Field
IDAHO		
Boise	435 Post Office Building	Field
Pocatello	403 North Main Street, Suite 3 MacKenzie Building	Field
ILLINOIS		
Chicago (Bellwood)	413 Mannheim Road	Field
	219 South Dearborn Street	Regional (Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin)
	321 South State Street	AIC
Des Plaines	2510 Dempster Street	Field
Lansing	18525 South Torrence Avenue	Field
Peoria	319 First National Bank Building	Field
Rockford	401 South Main Street, 224 Post Office Building	Field
Rock Island	1701 Second Avenue, 424 Cleveland Building	Field
Springfield	600 East Main Street, 324 U.S. Post Office and Court House	Field
Wood River	15 East Ferguson Avenue	Field
INDIANA		
Evansville	310 Post Office Building	Field
Fort Wayne	365 Federal Building	Field
Gary	610 Connecticut Street	Field
Indianapolis	36 South Pennsylvania Street	Field
	145 West Washington Street	AIC
South Bend	224 West Jefferson Boulevard, 315 Whitcomb-Keller Building	Field
IOWA		
Davenport	U.S. Court House, 351 Federal Building	Field
Des Moines	Fifth and Court Streets, 201 Federal Office Building	Field

State and City	*Address*	*Type of Office (Field, Regional, AIC)*
KANSAS		
Topeka	320 West 33d Street	Field
Wichita	114 South Main Street, 923 Beacon Building	Field
KENTUCKY		
Lexington	121 Walnut Street, 400 Nunn Building	Field
Louisville	139 South Fourth Street, Suite 600 Hoffman Building	Field
LOUISIANA		
Baton Rouge	333 Laurel Street, 830 Commerce Building	Field
New Orleans	701 Loyola Avenue, T-13041 Federal Building	Field
Shreveport	634 Travis Street, 301 Medical Arts Building	Field
MAINE		
Augusta	4 Union Street, Room 9	Field
Bangor	61 Main Street, Coe Block	Field
Portland	Post Office Building, Room 105	Field
MARYLAND		
Baltimore	103 South Gay Street, 316 Appraisers' Stores	Field
	1100 North Eutaw Street	AIC
District of Columbia (Suburban)	1111 20th Street, N.W., 321 Vanguard Building	Field
Hagerstown	No. 3 South Potomac Street, Professional Arts Building	Field
MASSACHUSETTS		
Boston	1703 John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Government Center	Field
	255 Huntington Avenue	AIC
	John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Government Center	Regional (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)

Lawrence	301 Essex Street, Room 210, Bay State Building	Field
Springfield	293 Bridge Street, 410-412 Stearns Building	Field
Worcester	500 Post Office Building	Field
MICHIGAN		
Battle Creek	74 North Washington Avenue Battle Creek Federal Center	Field
Detroit	234 State Street, 1510 Washington Boulevard Building	Field
	8600 Woodward Avenue	AIC
Grand Rapids	160 Ionia Avenue, NW.	Field
Lansing	106 West Allegan, Room 408	Field
Marquette	232 Harlowe Block Building	Field
Saginaw	103 Federal Building	Field
MINNESOTA		
Duluth	Federal Building, Room 204	Field
Minneapolis	110 South Fourth Street, 116 Federal Building	Field
	1629 Hennepin Avenue	AIC
Rochester	205 Post Office Building	Field
St. Paul	2147 University Avenue, Room 210	Field
	1058 University Avenue	AIC
MISSISSIPPI		
Gulfport	1319 24th Avenue	Field
Jackson	704 Milner Building	Field
MISSOURI		
Kansas City	911 Walnut Street, 1412 Federal Office Building	Field
	1411 Walnut Street	AIC
	911 Walnut Street, 2811 Federal Office Building	Regional (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota)
St. Louis	208 North Broadway, 1208 Federal Building	Field
	505 Washington Avenue	AIC

State and City	*Address*	*Type of Office (Field, Regional, AIC)*
MONTANA		
Butte	310 Federal Office Building	Field
Great Falls	510 First Avenue, North, 205 Professional Building	Field
Helena	South Annex Power Block, Room 1	Field
NEBRASKA		
Omaha	214 North 17th Street, 2412 Federal Office Building	Field
NEVADA		
Las Vegas	2301 East Sahara Avenue, Room 2	Field
Reno	300 Booth Street	Field
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
Concord	Federal Building, Room 321	Field
NEW JERSEY		
Camden	519 Federal Street	AIC
New Brunswick	96 Bayard Street, Room 14	Field
Newark	424 Federal Building, Federal Square	Field
	1 Clinton Street	AIC
Paterson	301 Graham Avenue	AIC
Trenton	405 Federal Building	Field
NEW MEXICO		
Albuquerque	517 Gold Avenue, SW.	Field
Roswell	413 North Virginia Street, Room 4	Field
NEW YORK		
Albany	406-408 New Post Office Building	Field
Binghampton	314 Post Office Building	Field
Buffalo	69 Niagara Square, 501 U.S. Court House	Field
Hempstead, L. I.	119 West Chippewa Street	AIC
New York	320 Fulton Avenue, Room 402	Field
	45 Broadway, Room 424	Field
	341 Ninth Avenue, 906 Parcel Post Building	Regional (New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands)
	255 West 54th Street	AIC

Rochester	Church Street, 211 U.S. Post Office and Court House Building	Field
Syracuse	321 Erie Boulevard, West, 208 O'Donnell Building	Field
NORTH CAROLINA		
Charlotte	316 East Morehead Street, 415 BSR Building	Field
Greensboro	Post Office Building, Room 433	Field
Raleigh	1330 Saint Mary's Street, Room 121	Field
Salisbury	132 North Main Street	Field
NORTH DAKOTA		
Fargo	510 Fourth Avenue, North	Field
OHIO		
Akron	72 South High Street	Field
Canton	1020 Market Avenue, North	Field
Cincinnati	740 U.S. Post Office Building	Field
	1916 Central Parkway	AIC
Cleveland	401 Euclid Avenue	Field
	1240 East Ninth Street, 831 Federal Office Building	Regional (Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio)
	779 Rockwell Avenue	AIC
Columbus	74 East Gay Street	Field
Dayton	25 South Main Street, 701 Twenty-Five South Main Building	Field
Toledo	234 Summit Street, 7206 Federal Office Building	Field
Youngstown	9 West Front Street	Field
OKLAHOMA		
Oklahoma City	Third and North Robinson, Post Office Building	Field
Tulsa	430 South Boulder Street	Field
OREGON		
Eugene	835 Park East	Field
Portland	520 SW. Morrison Street, 307 U.S. Court House	Field
	1030 NE. Couch Street	AIC

State and City	*Address*	*Type of Office (Field, Regional, AIC)*
PENNSYLVANIA		
Allentown	133 North Fifth Street, 201 Allen Law Building	Field
Altoona	1216-18 11th Avenue, 231 Central Trust Building	Field
Erie	Sixth and State Streets, 316 Federal Building	Field
Chambersburg	Professional Arts Building, Room 321	Regional (Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia)
Harrisburg	Seventh and Forester Streets, 1543 Labor and Industry Building	Field
Philadelphia	Ninth and Market Streets, 5014 U.S. Post Office and Court House	Field
	1221 North Broad Street	AIC
Pittsburgh	1102 New Federal Building	Field
	915 Penn Avenue	AIC
Reading	Fifth and Washington Streets, 212 U.S. Post Office Building	Field
Scranton	303 U.S. Post Office Building	Field
Williamsport	734 West Fourth Street, c/o Penn State Employment Service	Field
York	200 South George Street, 221 York Post Office Building	Field
RHODE ISLAND		
Providence	East Providence Post Office Building	Field
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Charleston	334 Meeting Street	Field
Columbia	901 Sumter Street, Room 502-A	Field
Spartanburg	273 South Church Street	Field
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Sioux Falls	513 South Main Avenue, Room 407	Field
TENNESSEE		
Chattanooga	900 Georgia Avenue	Field
Kingsport	320 West Center Street	Field
Knoxville	301 Cumberland Avenue, Room 232	Field

Memphis	167 North Main Street, 214 Federal Office Building	Field
Nashville	801 Broad Street, 780 U.S. Court House	Field
	1807 Hayes Street	AIC
TEXAS		
Amarillo	804 Bryan Street, Room 218	Field
Austin	300 East Eighth Street	Field
Beaumont	573 Pearl Street	Field
Corpus Christi	205 North Chaparral Street	Field
Dallas	1416 Commerce Street, Room 1003	Field
	411 North Akard Street, Room 312	Regional (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas)
El Paso	218 North Campbell Street, Room 214	Field
Houston	515 Rusk Street, 8605 Court House and Federal Building	Field
	2800 Travis Street	AIC
Longview	222-24 East Methrin Street, 211 Earlee Building	Field
San Antonio	651 South Main	Field
Waco	800 Franklin Avenue	Field
Fort Worth	10th and Lamarr Streets, 410 U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building	Field
UTAH		
Salt Lake City	125 South State Street, 6412 Federal Building	Field
VERMONT		
Burlington	Elmwood Avenue, P.O. Box 966, Federal Building	Field
VIRGINIA		
Norfolk	102 West Olney Road, 304 Allard Building	Field
	904 Granby Street	AIC
Richmond	400 North Eighth Street, Room 10-021	Field
WASHINGTON		
Seattle	506 Second Avenue, 2006 Smith Tower	Field
	1933 Fifth Avenue	AIC
	506 Second Avenue, 1809 Smith Tower	Regional (Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Idaho)

State and City	*Address*	*Type of Office (Field, Regional, AIC)*
WASHINGTON (cont'd.)		
Spokane	208 Post Office Building	Field
Tacoma	412 Post Office Building	Field
WEST VIRGINIA		
Charleston	500 Quarrier Street, 3011 Federal Building	Field
Clarksburg	500 West Pike Street, 211 Post Office Building	Field
Wheeling	12th and Chapline Streets 433 Federal Building	Field
WISCONSIN		
LaCrosse	214 Post Office Building	Field
Madison	4802 Sheboygan Avenue, Room 585	Field
Milwaukee	819 North Sixth Street, Room 160	Field
Oshkosh	208 Post Office Building	Field
Racine	429 Main Street, 107 Arcade Building	Field
WYOMING		
Casper	254 North Center Street, Room 103	Field
Cheyenne	2120 Capital Avenue, P.O. 1126, Room 2015	Field

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1967 O - 275-095

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Copies of this publication or additional information on manpower programs and activities may be obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in Washington, D.C. Publications on manpower are also available from the Department's Regional Information Offices at the addresses listed below.

John F. Kennedy Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203
341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York 10001
Wolf Avenue and Commerce Street, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania 17201
Ninth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309
51 SW. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33130
801 Broad Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
1365 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114
219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604
911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
411 North Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75201
19th and Stout Streets, Denver, Colorado 80202
300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102
506 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Curtis C. Aller, Associate Manpower Administrator
for Policy, Evaluation, and Research

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20210

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

DR R E TAYLOR DIR 500
CNTR RES DEV VOC & TECH ED
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLUMBUS OHIO 43210